DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 715 EC 182 319

TITLE	Gifted and Talented Program. Final Evaluation Report, 1984-1985. E.C.I.A. Chapter 2.
INSTITUTION	District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. Div. of Quality Assurance.
PUB DATE	Sep 85
NOTE	64p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The report presents evaluation findings of the Gifted and Talented (G and T) Education program in the District of Columbia Public Schools. An introductory section provides background information and a project description. The evaluation follows the Planning, Monitoring, and Implementing Evaluation Model for Decision Making. An interim report, which described agreements or discrepancies between intended and observed inputs and processes, is updated in this report and agreements or discrepancies between intended and observed outcomes for each objective are specified. Objectives include providing an enriched curriculum for identified students, demonstrating student above-average academic and creativity performance, and showing positive student, teacher, and parent attitudes toward the project. Appended material makes up more than half the report and includes a list of participating schools, agendas for the divisional Olympics of the Mind competition, and student, parent, and teacher questionnaires and response concerning the G and T program. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED268715

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT E.C.I.A CHAPTER 2

SEPTEMBER 1985

FLORETTA D. Mc KENZIE
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

EC 182319

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Cooper
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

District of Columbia Public Schools

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

1984-1985

Prepared by
Division of Quality Assurance

EC 18 2 319

1984-1985

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROJECT

Phyllis Hines, Project Coordinator

James Guines, Project Manager

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Gilbert Hoffman	LEA Director, Chapter 2

DIVISION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

David Huie	Director
June Bland	Assistant for Evaluation

ECIA CHAPTER 2 EVALUATION UNIT

Marcia McBeath	Director
Nathala Cox	Research Associate
Mark Arenas	Acting Research Associate
Sheila Robinson	Evaluation Intern
Howard E. Bates	Secretary
Willie Kirkland	Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY AND FINDINGS	1
CHAPTER	
I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES	
Introduction	3
Description of the Project	4
II. EXTERNAL EVALUATION DESIGN	6
III. RESULTS	
Summary	8
Conclusions and Recommendations	9
Objective A	10
Objective B	15
Objective C	20
IV. APPENDIXES	
A. Evaluation Model Schema	24
B. Participating Schools	26
C. CTBS Scores and Percentile Ranks	28
D. Agendas for the Olympics of the Mind Competition	30
E. Student Attitudes Toward Aspects of the Gifted and Talented Project	35
F. Teacher Pesponses to Questionnaire	37
G. Parent Responses to Questionnaire	47
H. Questionnaires	52

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

Title

Gifted and Talented Education

Project Director

Phyllis Hines

Location

Headquartered at Bryan School with sites at 74 schools

Target Population

Students who have exceptional potential for superior performance in several areas of ability

Background

Since 1978, the Gifted and Talented (G and T) Project has made advances in developing a student identification procedure. The procedure is based on multiple criteria relative to the population and not on test scores alone. Progress has also been made in developing (a) appropriate materials, (b) a cadre of teachers and coordinators, (c) an enrichment curriculum, and (d) community involvement. Success has been achieved by students who received honors in the National Olympics of the Mind Competition.

Stated Objectives

A. During the 1984-85 school year, the Gifted and Talented (G and T) Education staff will provide an enriched curriculum for identified students.

B. By June, 1985, students in the G and T Project will demonstrate continued above average academic performance and creativity as shown by standardized test results and participation in the Olympics of the Mind.

C. By June, 1985, at least 80% of randomly selected students, teachers, and parents in the G and T Project will show a positive attitude toward the project.

Evaluation

The evaluation follows the Planning, Monitoring, and Implementing (PMI) Evaluation Model for Decision Making developed by the Division of Quality Assurance, District of Columbia Public Schools.

Findings

1. There were 74 programs in the gifted and Talented Project. Seven new schools were added to the 66 schools which continued in the project (see Appendix B). In addition, Region D participated in a program as a region.

2. Seven hundred twenty-two students in grades 3,6, and 9 were tested in mathematics, and 718 in the same grades were tested in language arts. Percentile ranks of students in all three grades continued above average in both mathematics and language arts. However, ninth grade students continued to score lower than third or sixth grade students in both subjects.

3. The Olympics of the Mind agenda indicated that 78% of the schools participated in the divisional competition.

4. Examination of the evaluation summaries by resource coordinators showed that students were provided with an enriched and differentiated curriculum.

5. Four staff development sessions were held with an average of 76% of the programs represented.

6. Although 97% of students and parents and 71% of teachers who responded indicated a positive attitude toward the Gifted and Talented Project, the sample sizes were too small for strong conclusions.

BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

Purpose -The purpose of the Gifted and Talented Project was to provide appropriate services to students in kindergarten through ninth grade who are identified as gifted and talented, with the intention of allowing maximum intellectual and artistic development.

Need - The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) believes that all students should be provided with an educational program which allows them to develop their potential abilities to the maximum. The implementation of this belief has for a long time been confined to the average population of students. The enactment of such laws as 94-143 led to the extension of this principle to the handicapped. Gifted students were given minimal consideration and remained an underdeveloped human resource factor. Gifted and talented students constitute a unique population who, because of their intellectual or artistic abilities, need educational opportunities which are commensurate with their level of functioning and which are challenging, diverse, and complex. The G and T Project seeks to provide such an experience. It provides a curriculum which promotes increased knowledge in the content areas, with a focus on mathematics and language arts and a high level of intellectual processing of information.

History - While it has espoused the philosophy of the development of individual potential to the maximum, the DCPS has for a long time had no mandate for services to the gifted and talented. Official recognition of this population occurred with the 1976 Policy Statement adopted by the Board of Education which addressed the need for services to G and T students and adopted the definition of G and T then used by the U.S Department of Education, Office of Gifted and Talented.

A project called the Minigrant Program for the Academically Gifted and Talented was started in 1978-79 with funds secured from the Department of Education and a continuing grant from ESEA Title IV-C. Under this project, grants were provided to 12 school-based programs. The 12 schools involved represented each of the school system's six administrative regions. Two programs, one each at the elementary and junior high school levels, operated in each region. The project has since expanded, with funds now coming from Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act of 1981. The project has been extended to the ninth grade. There are now 74 G and T programs distributed throughout the four administrative regions. The project has also expanded its basic components and activities to include the continued evaluation of the multiple identification procedure, the development and assessment of appropriate strategies and materials, staff development, the provision of an enriched and differentiated curriculum with an individualized instructional mode, participation in the Olympics of the Mind Competition, summer enrichment programs, and a heavy utilization of community resources. A major goal of the project is to develop program models that will eventually enable individual schools to provide services to the G and T population with little or no outside financial support.

Among the project's latest developments is the adoption by the Board of Education on July 19, 1985, of a new policy on G and T education. This policy resulted from a recommendation in the Gifted and Talented Comprehensive Plan, developed by the G and T Project staff.

Description of the Project

The G and T Project seeks to develop the academic and creative potential of gifted and talented students through an enriched and differentiated curriculum, individualized instruction, and appropriate enrichment strategies and materials.

Student Selection - The G and T students are those who fall within the upper 10% of their school population on the Baldwin Identification Matrix.

Curriculum -The Competency Based Curriculum (CBC) provides the content of the curriculum. Instruction is given in the core areas of mathematics and language arts. Music, science, social studies, art, and media production are optional areas. Participation in the Olympics of the Mind Competition is also optional, but it is encouraged. The CBC curriculum is expanded to broaden student exposure through various teaching-learning models appropriate for G and T populations. Major features of the curriculum are raising the level of intellectual functioning and increasing critical thinking skills. The high-level thought processes developed include psychological differentiation, conceptualization and categorization, quantitative and qualitative invariance functions, abstractions, synthesis, and other forms of mental control and manipulation. There is extensive focus on the development of reflective thought and complex thought patterns. Among the instructional strategies used are Bloom's Taxonomy, William's Model of Learning, Guilford's Structure of the Intellect, and Renzulli's Model.

Instruction -Instruction is guided by various needs and learning styles of students. Learning styles are determined by objective measures, teacher intuition and insight, and other procedures. CBC, G and T, and teacher-developed materials are used. One of six delivery systems is used, depending on the unique needs, focus, and resources of the school. The delivery systems are (a) content enrichment-acceleration in the regular class, (b) cluster grouping, (c) part-time special classes, (d) full-time classes, (e) subject area acceleration, and (f) grade acceleration.

Community Involvement

Involvement of the community is encouraged through student internships, community mentors, parent involvement, field trips, and work experience with social organizations.

Staff

For each program, there is a designated coordinator who may be a principal, G and T teacher, counselor, librarian, or other teacher. Staff development

activities, designed to meet staff needs, are held on a continuous basis and contribute to the success of the programs.

Dissemination

Information about the program is disemminated through flyers, newsletters, and letters. The project director also holds awareness sessions.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION DESIGN - PLANNING, MONITORING, AND IMPLEMENTING (PMI) EVALUATION MODEL FOR DECISION MAKING

The evaluation follows the Planning, Monitoring, and Implementing (PMI) Evaluation Model for Decision Making which was developed by the Division of Quality Assurance, District of Columbia Public Schools (see Appendix A). The evaluation design, which was developed at the beginning of the project year, consisted of the intended inputs, processes, and outcomes on specially designed status report forms. The interim report, which was distributed at the mid-point of the project cycle, described agreements or discrepancies between intended and observed inputs and processes. This final report includes the interim report data brought up to date plus the agreements and discrepancies between intended and observed outcomes for each objective. Supporting data are included in the appendixes. Preceding the PMI status report forms is the results section which summarizes the agreements and discrepancies for each objective and which states a general conclusion.

RESULTS

EVALUATION RESULTS SUMMARY

Objective A: During the 1984-85 school year, the Gifted and Talented Education staff will provide an enriched curriculum for identified students.

There was agreement between all of the intended and observed inputs and processes and between two of the three outcomes. Seventy-three schools participated in the project, seven of which were new. In addition, Region D participated as a Region, bringing the total number of programs to 74. Results indicated that students were provided with an enriched and differentiated curriculum. However, an average of 76% of the programs were represented at the four staff development sessions. This was slightly less than the minimum of 80% intended representation (see Chapter 3).

Objective B: By June, 1985, students in the G and T Project will demonstrate continued above average academic performance and creativity as shown by standardized test results and participation in the Olympics of the Mind.

There was agreement between all of the intended and observed inputs, processess, and outcomes. G and T students continued to perform above average in mathematics and language arts. Percentile ranks in mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 9 were 76, 81, and 68, respectively. Percentile ranks in language arts for grades 3, 6, and 9 were 82, 82, and 69, respectively. Seventy-eight percent of the programs were represented in the Olympics of the Mind Divisional Competition.

Objective C: By June 1985, at least 80% of randomly selected students, teachers, and parents in the G and T Project will show a positive attitude toward the project.

There was agreement between all of the intended and observed inputs and processes and between two of the three outcomes. More than 80% of both students (97.3%) and parents (97.1%) who responded had a positive attitude toward the G and T Project. However, 70.7% of teachers who responded had a positive attitude, which was less than the intended 80%. Care must be given to the interpretation of these results because of the small sample sizes.

Conclusions

The goal of the Gifted and Talented Education Project was to provide appropriate services to all students identified as having exceptional potential for superior performance. Students were provided with an enriched and differentiated curriculum, and they continued above average academic performance as measured by CTBS test scores and participation in the Olympics of the Mind Competition.

In the 1983-84 report of the Gifted and Talented Project, a concern was expressed that although the students in the project tested above average, the CTBS percentile ranks for the ninth grade students were low (68 in mathematics and 76 in language arts). During the current year, ninth grade percentile ranks in mathematics remained the same as last year (68) and dropped from 76 to 69 in language arts. These results reinforce the concern for the performance of these students on the CTBS.

Because of very low sample sizes, strong conclusions cannot be drawn regarding student, teacher, and parent attitudes toward the Gifted and Talented Project.

Decisions

This report will be forwarded to the project director, project manager, LEA Chapter 2 director, the superintendent, and the Board of Education to aid them in making decisions about this project.

Recommendations

1. Items under each objective are too numerous and detailed for inclusion in the report. Some of them may be useful for the Gifted and Talented Project staff to use in monitoring their procedures.

2. A much larger sample must be obtained in order to draw strong conclusions. If the sample size is not adequate, the data should not be analyzed.

FINAL REPORT

PLANNING, MONITORING, AND IMPLEMENTING (PMI)
EVALUATION MODEL FOR DECISION MAKING

Reporting Form

Goal: The goal of the Gifted and Talented Education Project is to provide appropriate services to all students identified as having exceptional potential for superior performance.

Objective A: During the 1984-85 school year, the Gifted and Talented Education staff will provide an enriched curriculum for identified students.

PART I

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
a. Project coordinator	Agreement	a. Evaluation Team members met with the project coordinator.
b. Assistant to the coordinator	Agreement	b. Evaluation Team members met with the assistant to the coordinator.
c. Resource coordinators	Agreement	c. The resource coordinators started in October. They were formerly teachers of the gifted.
d. Project secretary	Agreement	d. The project coordinator verified that a secretary is available.
e. Gifted and Talented students in participating classes	Agreement	e. Rosters of students participating in the project were submitted to the Evaluation Unit members.
f. Teachers in participating schools	Agreement	f. Rosters of teachers participating in the project were submitted to the Evaluation Unit members.

OBJECTIVE A

PART I (continued)

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
g. Principals in participating schools	Agreement	g. Rosters of principals participating in the project were submitted to the Evaluation Unit members.
h. Coordinators in participating schools	Agreement	h. Rosters of coordinators participating in the project were submitted to the Evaluation Unit members.
i. Consultants for staff development sessions	Agreement	i. Sample agendas for staff development sessions, complete with names of the presenting consultants, were submitted to the Evaluation Unit members.
j. Forms to collect project participation data	Agreement	j. The form, "Guidelines For the Gifted and Talented Education Program" is on file in the Evaluation Unit. Examples of completed forms were examined by Evauation Unit members.
k. Outline for Action Plans	Agreement	k. A copy of the "Yearly Action Plan" Form was examined by Evaluation Unit members.
l. Schedule of staff development sessions	Agreement	l. A "Calendar of Events" for school year 1984-85 which included staff development sessions for gifted education on 11/1/84 and 3/9/85 was examined by Evaluation Unit members.

OBJECTIVE A

PART I (continued)

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
m. Materials for staff development sessions	Agreement	m. Samples of handouts and all other materials used for staff development sessions for G and T coordinators were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
n. Evaluation forms for staff development	Agreement	n. Samples of completed evaluation forms for the staff development sessions were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
o. Adequate space for staff development sessions	Agreement	o. The project coordinator verified that adequate space was available, including the auditorium at Payne Elementary School for groups of 50 or more.

OBJECTIVE A

PART II

PROCESSES †

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1.1 Principals will submit project participation information (compliance sheets, staff rosters, student rosters, information on grade levels served, academic areas offered, and schedule of student services).	Agreement	1.1 The intended and additional information, including modifications, expected outcomes, major problems, and products developed was also provided as verified by the project coordinator.
1.2 Principals and/or coordinators will complete and submit action plans.	Agreement	1.2 Examples of the "Yearly Action Plan" which included information about objectives, activities, resources, and evaluation were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
2.1 Staff development sessions relating to an enriched or differentiated curriculum will be held.	Agreement	2.1 Specific types of staff development were verified by listings on the Calendar of Events and agendas for each particular session.
2.2 Project teachers will attend staff development sessions.	Agreement	2.2 Samples of sign-in sheets used for the sessions were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
2.3 Project teachers will complete staff development evaluation forms.	Agreement	2.3 Completed evaluation forms were on file in the G and T office and were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
3.1 Teachers will follow the action plans with the G and T students.	Agreement	3.1 The following of action plans was confirmed through observations conducted by project staff using a monitoring form.

† Processes numbered to correspond with outcomes

OBJECTIVE A

PART III

OUTCOMES

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1. Records submitted by the project coordinator to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1985 will show that 66 continuing G and T programs and 3 new G and T programs are operating in the D.C. Public Schools.	Agreement	1. Records submitted to the chapter 2 Evaluation Unit showed that there were 74 G and T programs. Sixty-six schools from the preceding year continued in the project, and seven new schools were added. They were King, Montgomery, Ludlow-Taylor, Maury, Houston, Plummer, and Nalle. In addition, Region D participated in a program as a region, bringing the number of programs to 74.
2. Records submitted by the G and T Project coordinator to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1985 will show that a minimum of 4 staff development sessions have been held, emphasizing an enriched or differentiated curriculum, with an average of at least 80% of the programs represented.	Disrepancy	2. Sign-in sheets submitted by the G and T project coordinator to the chapter 2 Evaluation Unit showed that four staff development sessions were held, with on average of 76% of the programs represented. The percentage of programs represented at each session was 86%, 72%, 84% and 59%, respectively.
3. By June, 1985 classroom observation summaries submitted by the G and T project coordinator to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit will show that students were provided with an enriched and/or differentiated curriculum.	Agreement	3. Examination of the evaluation summaries by resource coordinators showed that students were provided with an enriched or differentiated curriculum. In some cases, help was needed to bring teachers up to the level designated by the project.

FINAL REPORT

PLANNING, MONITORING, AND IMPLEMENTING (PMI)
EVALUATION MODEL FOR DECISION MAKING

Reporting Form

Goal: The goal of the Gifted and Talented Education Project is to provide appropriate services to all students identified as having exceptional potential for superior performance.

Objective B: By June, 1985, students in the G and T Project will demonstrate continued above average academic performance and creativity as shown by standardized test results and participation in the Olympics of the Mind.

PART I

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
Inputs a through f are the same as in Objective A. Please see page 10.		
g. G and T coordinators/coaches	Agreement	g. Participation of coordinators and coaches in the G and T Project was verified by the project coordinator.
h. Volunteer associate directors of Olympics of the Mind	Agreement	h. The project coordinator verified that volunteer associate directors participated.
i. Volunteer judges, Olympics of the Mind	Agreement	i. Volunteer judges have been recruited from a variety of sources and were verified by sign-in sheets examined by Evaluation Unit members.
j. Materials for Olympics of the Mind orientation sessions	Agreement	j. Some of the materials, including problem descriptions, were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
k. Materials for Olympics of the Mind training sessions	Agreement	k. The workshop guide and training manual for the G and T Project were examined by Evaluation Unit members.

OBJECTIVE B

PART I (continued)

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
l. G and T resource materials	Agreement	l. The project coordinator verified that resource materials were available.
m. Funds for special classroom materials and program costs for an enriched and/or differentiated curriculum	Agreement	m. A funding procedure that allocates $1,000 per school was set up and was administered by the local school administrator.
n. Adequate space and facilities for G and T instruction	Agreement	n. Regular classrooms as well as community facilities were available for G and T instruction.
o. Adequate space and facilities to hold the Olympics of the Mind Competition	Agreement	o. Fletcher-Johnson Junior High School was the site for the Olympics of the Mind Competition, as evidenced by Buildings and Grounds Use Agreement Form (#5-A) of 2/12/85.

OBJECTIVE B

PART II

PROCESSES †

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1.1 Teachers in participating schools will present students with an enriched and/or differentiated curriculum as outlined in their school action plans.	Agreement	1.1 Samples of school action plans were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
1.2 Project students will participate in the city-wide testing program.	Agreement	1.2 CTBS testing took place in May.
2.1 The G and T project coordinator will conduct an orientation session with principals, coordinator/coaches, and Olympics of the Mind (OM) Board of Directors to familiarize and/or update them on the program.	Agreement	2.1 The agenda for an orientation update meeting (10/1/84) that outlined changes for the 84-85 SY was examined by Evaluation Unit members.
2.2 The project coordinators will submit OM registration information to the OM headquarters in New Jersey.	Agreement	2.2 Evaluation Unit members examined address labels sent from OM headquarters, which confirmed registration by project coordinators.
2.3 Associate coordinators of OM will conduct training sessions for the coaches to review the five problems from which selections for the competition will be made.	Agreement	2.3 Sign-in sheets, agendas, and the five problems discussed at the OM training sessions were examined by Evaluation Unit members.

† Processes numbered to correspond with outcomes

OBJECTIVE B

PART II (continued)

PROCESSES †

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
2.4 The project coordinator and associate coordinator of the Olympics of the Mind Competition will plan and conduct training sessions for the volunteer judges.	Agreement	2.4 Evaluation Unit members examined sign-in sheets and agendas for the training sessions of 2/20/85 where judges were provided with guidelines for judging the OM competition.
2.5 Each participating school will select at least one of the five problems in at least one of the three age/grade categories.	Agreement	2.5 Sample forms (a compliance contract in which schools specify their problem selection in order to receive funding) were examined by Evaluation Unit members.
2.6 Coaches will work with students individually and in groups on the selected problem(s).	Agreement	2.6 The project coordinator verified that this was done.
2.7 Each participating school will select a team of one to seven students to represent the school at the divisional competition.	Agreement	2.7 Lists of participating schools and their 7 student members are on file with the project coordinator.
2.8 The project coordinator will submit Olympics of the Mind agendas and/or programs to the Evaluation Unit.	Agreement	2.8 Agendas are on file in the Evaluation Unit office.

† Processes numbered to correspond with outcomes

OBJECTIVE B

PART III

OUTCOMES

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1. An analysis of 1984 standardized test raw scores obtained from the Office of Assessment will show that the mean mathematics and language arts scores of G and T students in the grades measured by the citywide testing program will continue to be above average.	Agreement	1. The spring, 1984 CTBS mean raw scores in mathematics and language arts of G and T students continued to be above average. Percentile ranks in mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 9 were 76, 81, and 68, respectively. Percentile ranks in language arts for grades 3, 6, and 9 were 82, 82, and 69, respectively.
2. Agendas of Olympics of the Mind contests, submitted by the G and T Project coordinator to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1984, will show that the majority of the local school G and T programs were represented in at least one level of the tournament.	Agreement	2. The Olympics of the Mind agenda showed that 78% of the local school G and T programs were represented in the divisional competition.

FINAL REPORT

PLANNING, MONITORING, AND IMPLEMENTING (PMI)
EVALUATION MODEL FOR DECISION MAKING

Reporting Form

Goal: The goal of the Gifted and Talented Education Project is to provide appropriate services to all students identified as having exceptional potential for superior performance.

Objective C: By June 1985, at least 80% of randomly selected students, teachers, and parents in the G and T Project will show a positive attitude toward the project.

PART I

INPUTS

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
Inputs a through e are the same as in Objective A. Please see page 10.		
f. Parents of students in participating schools	Agreement	f. School records contain names of parents and guardians.
g. G and T resource materials	Agreement	g. Evaluation Unit members examined material at Bryan Elementary School.
h. Funds for special classroom materials and program costs for an enriched and/or differentiated curriculum	Agreement	h. The project coordinator has established a funding system that allocates 50% of a given school's allotment at the beginning of the school year and the remaining 50% when a written action plan is submitted.
i. Attitude assessment forms for students, teachers, and parents	Agreement	i. Attitude assessment forms are on file in the Evaluation Unit office.
j. Adequate space and facilities for G and T instruction	Agreement	j. Regular classrooms as well as community resources (e.g., museums, courthouses, etc.) are available for use and are being used, as verified by the project coordinator.

OBJECTIVE C

PART II

PROCESSES †

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1,2 and 3 Evaluation personnel will assist the project director in revising attitude scales.	Agreement	1,2 and 3 Revised attitude scales are on file.
1.1 Teachers in participating schools will present students with an enriched and/or differentiated curriculum as outlined in their school action plans.	Agreement	1.1 Examination of the evaluation summaries by resource coordinators showed that students wre provided with the enriched or differentiated curriculum. In some cases, help was needed to bring teachers up to the level designated by the project.
1.2 Attitude assessments will be administered in April to a sampling of students.	Agreement	1.2 Attitude assessments were admininstered as evidenced by the transmittal letter dated April 30, 1985.
2.1 G and T resource coordinators will provide technical assistance to classroom teachers.	Agreement	2.1 Resource coordinators (who were formerly G and T teachers) provided formal and informal technical assistance. During summer 1984, workshops on "Developing Programs for G and T Students" and "Critical Thinking and Problem Solving" were held. From 11/6/84 to 12/12/84 a class titled "Teaching Methods for G and T Students" was held. Agendas, handouts, and evaluations for these and other programs were examined by Evaluation Unit members.

† Processes numbered to correspond with outcomes

OBJECTIVE C

PART II (continued)

PROCESSES †

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
2.2 Information about the G and T project will be disseminated through local programs and the G and T office.	Agreement	2.2 Letters to resource coordinators, principals, and teachers, plus fact sheets and newsletters, are on file in the G and T project coordinator's office.
2.3 Attitude assessments will be administered in April to a sampling of teachers.	Agreement	2.3 Attitude assessments were administered to a sampling of teachers (N=26).
3.1 The project director will conduct a forum for interested G and T parents.	Agreement	3.1 Parents' forum was held on 11/1/84 at River Terrace Elementary School.
3.2 Attitude assessments will be administered in April to a sampling of parents.	Agreement	3.2 Attitude assessments were administered to a sampling of parents (N=174).

† Processes numbered to correspond with outcomes

OBJECTIVE C

PART III

OUTCOMES

INTENDED	STATUS	OBSERVED
1. An analysis of attitude scale scores submitted by the G and T project director to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1984 will show that at least 80% of the randomly sampled G and T students will show a positive attitude toward the project.	Agreement	1. Attitude scale scores of students who responded indicated that 97.3% liked the G and T Project either "very much" or "a little," with 75.9% indicating "very much." The aspect of the project that students liked most was learning new things (94.9%). They liked least the large amount of work (15.5%).
2. An analysis of attitude scale scores submitted by the G and T project director to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1984 will show that at least 80% of the randomly sampled G and T teachers will show a positive attitude toward the project.	Discrepancy	2. Results of the attitude scale scores of teachers who responded indicated that 70.7% had a positive attitude toward the project, and 21.9% were neutral.
3. An analysis of attitude scale scores submitted by the G and T project director to the Chapter 2 Evaluation Unit by June, 1984 will show that at least 80% of the randomly sampled G and T parents will show a positive attitude toward the project.	Agreement	3. Table 12 in Appendix G shows that 97.1% of the parents who responded had a positive attitude toward the G and T Project, with 61.3% indicating that it greatly benefitted their children and 35.8% stating that it was of moderate benefit.

Appendix A

Evaluation Model Schema

Appendix B

Participating Schools in the

Gifted and Talented Project

Participating Schools in the
Gifted and Talented Project 1984-85

Region A

N=15 20.5%

Green
Hendley
King, Martin Luther
McGogney
Montgomery
Patterson
Savoy
Terrell, M. C.
Van Ness
Washington Highlands
Wilkinson
Wilson, J.O.

Hart
Jefferson
Johnson

Region B

N=15 20.5%

Barnard
Brightwood
Janney
LaSalle
Murch
Oyster
Petworth
Powell
Raymond
Shepherd
Takoma
West

MacFarland
Paul
Rabaut

Region C

N=10 13.7%

Adams
Bancroft
Emery
Fort Lincoln
Noyes
Shaed

Backus
Browne
Lincoln
Taft

Region D

N=33 45.2%

Aiton
Beers
Benning
Brent
Bryan
Burrville
Carver
Fletcher-Johnson
Gibbs
Giddings
Harris
Hobson Middle
Houston
Kimball

Kingsman
Ludlow-Taylor
Maury
Merritt
Miner
Nalle
Orr
Payne
Plummer
River Terrace
Shadd
Smothers
Winston

Eliot
Evans
Miller
Sousa
Stuart
Woodson, C.G.

Appendix C

CTBS Scores and Percentile Ranks

Table 1

1984 CTBS Mean Scores and Percentile Ranks in Mathematics and Language Arts for Grades 3, 6, and 9

	Mathematics			Language Arts		
Grade	N	Mean raw score	Percentile	N	Mean raw score	Percentile
3	307	85.2	76	304	81.3	82
6	314	85.9	81	313	93.2	82
9	101	52.6	68	101	60.7	69

Appendix D

Agendas for Olympics of the Mind Competitions

Divisional OM Competition

Fletcher-Johnson Educational Center

March 2, 1985

ECOLOGY DOZER

Long Range	School	Spontaneous Problem	Division
9:00	Browne	10:00	II
9:15	Coolidge	10:10	III
9:30	Eastern	10:20	III

HI TECH: SMARTY PANTS

9:00	Wilson	11:15	I
9:12	Orr	11:20	I
9:24	Eliot	11:25	II
9:36	Fletcher-Johnson	11:30	II
9:48	Harris	11:35	II
10:00	Johnson	11:40	II
10:12	Sousa	11:45	II
10:24	Browne	11:50	III
10:36	McFarland	11:55	III

CLASSICS...MUSIC, MAESTRO, PLEASE

10:24	Janney	11:25	I
9:00	Green	10:50	I
9:12	Harris	10:55	I
9:24	LaSalle	11:00	I
9:36	Petworth	11:05	I
9:48	Shepherd	11:10	I
10:00	Washington Highlands	11:15	I
10:12	Wilkinson	11:20	I
9:00	Backus	11:55	II
9:12	Browne	10:55	II
9:24	Evans	11:00	II
9:36	Hart	11:05	II
9:48	Kimball	11:10	II
10:00	Lincoln	11:15	II
10:12	Miller	11:20	II
10:24	River Terrace/Smothers	11:25	II
10:36	Shaed	11:30	II
10:48	Shepherd	11:35	II
11:00	LaSalle	11:40	II
11:12	Adams	11:45	II
11:24	Rabaut	11:50	II
11:36	Johnson	10:50	II
11:48	Murch	10:45	II
12:00	Washington Highlands	12:20	II

Divisional OM Competition (Continued)

COMPOUND FRACTURE

Long Range	School	Spontaneous Problem	Division
9:00	Gibbs	10:50	I
9:10	Orr	10:55	I
9:20	West	11:00	I
9:30	Fletcher-Johnson	11:05	II
9:40	Hobson	11:10	II
9:50	Taft	11:15	II
10:00	West	11:20	II
10:20	Ballou	11:25	III
10:30	Johnson	11:30	III

THE BIG TOP

9:00	Bancroft	10:05	I
9:10	Benning	10:10	I
9:20	Brent	10:15	I
9:30	Carver	10:20	I
9:40	Emery	10:25	I
9:50	Harris	10:30	I
10:00	Hendley	9:00	I
10:10	Miner	9:05	I
10:20	Payne	9:10	I
10:30	Savoy	9:15	I
10:40	Takoma	9:20	I
10:50	Shadd	9:25	I
11:00	West	9:30	I
11:10	Wilson	9:35	I
11:20	Powell	9:40	I
11:30	Winston	9:45	I
11:40	Ft. Lincoln	9:50	I
11:50	Burrville	9:55	I
12:00	Raymond	10:00	I
12:10	Merritt	10:35	I
9:00	Backus	9:50	II
9:12	Barnard	9:55	II
9:24	Beers	10:00	II
9:36	Browne	10:05	II
9:48	Bryan	9:00	II
10:00	Giddings	9:05	II
10:12	Patterson	9:10	II
10:24	Takoma	9:15	II
10:36	Woodson	9:20	II
10:48	Kingsman	9:25	II
11:00	Green	9:30	II
11:12	Johnson	9:35	II
11:24	Noyes	9:40	II
11:36	McGogney	9:45	II
11:48	Janney	10:10	II

MOTHER GOOSE

Grades K - 2

Schools will share solutions starting at 12 noon in the auditorium. Paricipating schools are as following:

Adams

Emery

Janney

McGogney

Wilkinson

City Wide OM Competition

Fletcher-Johnson Educational Center

March 16, 1985
8:30 a.m.

HI TECH: SMARTY PANTS

Long Range	School	Spontaneous Problem	Division
9:00	Eliot	10:00	II
9:12	Fletcher-Johnson	10:05	II
9:24	Johnson	10:10	II
9:36	Browne	10:15	III

CLASSICS... MUSIC, MAESTRO, PLEASE

9:00	Green	9:45	I
9:12	Harris	9:50	I
9:24	Janney	9:55	I
9:36	Shepherd	10:00	I
9:48	Miller	9:15	II
10:00	Murch	9:10	II
10:12	Shepherd	9:05	II
10:24	Washington Hgld.	9:00	II

COMPOUND FRACTURE

9:00	Fletcher-Johnson	10:00	II
9:10	Hobson	10:05	II
9:20	West	10:10	II

THE BIG TOP

9:00	Bancroft	9:45	I
9:10	Emery	9:50	I
9:20	Hendley	9:55	I
9:30	Payne	10:00	I
9:40	Browne	9:15	II
9:50	Green	9:10	II
10:00	Janney	9:05	II
10:10	Kingsman	9:00	II

10:30	MOTHER GOOSE	AUDITORIUM
11:00	AWARDS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	AUDITORIUM

Appendix E

Student Attitudes Toward Aspects

of the Gifted and Talented Project

Table 2

Student Attitudes Toward
Aspects of the Gifted and Talented Project

Program aspect	Like Very Much		Like A Little		Do Not Like		Total	Not In My Program	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%
High teacher expectation	299	77.5	77	19.9	9	2.3	385	1	0.5
Challenge of hard work	231	58.2	150	37.8	10	2.5	391	6	2.7
Large amount of work	131	34.5	177	46.6	59	15.5	367	13	5.9
Homework	162	43.3	162	43.3	27	7.2	351	23	10.5
Mathematics	243	71.1	58	17.0	10	2.9	311	31	14.2
Language Arts	233	66.8	91	26.1	6	1.7	330	19	8.7
Visual Arts	214	63.9	79	23.6	3	0.9	296	39	17.8
Performing Arts	223	65.2	45	13.2	4	1.2	272	70	31.9
The way teacher(s) taught	290	74.2	96	24.6	5	1.3	391	0	0.0
Being able to work on things on my own	320	81.8	65	16.6	4	1.0	389	2	0.9
Work with others	298	76.0	78	19.9	15	3.8	391	1	0.5
Learning about many things	367	93.6	23	5.9	0	0.0	390	2	0.9
Learning new things	369	94.9	20	5.1	0	0.0	389	0	0.0
Being creative	359	91.3	32	8.1	2	0.5	393	0	0.0
Field trips	353	90.5	26	6.7	2	0.5	381	9	4.1
Special projects	320	81.8	64	16.4	4	1.0	388	3	1.4
Total	4412	75.9	1243	21.4	160	2.7	5815	219	100.0

Appendix F

Teacher Responses to Questionnaire

Table 3

Teacher Attitudes Toward the Gifted and Talented Project

Item	Excellent		Good		Neutral		Fair		Poor		Number of Respondents
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
A	7	31.8	9	40.9	5	22.7	1	4.5	0	0.0	22
B	5	19.2	12	46.2	6	23.1	3	11.5	0	0.0	26
C	4	25.0	9	56.3	3	18.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	16
D	15	65.2	5	21.7	2	8.7	0	0.0	1	4.3	23
E	12	50.0	10	41.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	24
F	12	48.0	10	40.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25
G	9	37.5	10	41.7	5	20.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	24
H	10	40.0	10	40.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	25
I	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4
J	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8
K	13	50.0	10	38.5	2	7.7	1	3.8	0	0.0	26
L	2	8.7	7	30.4	10	43.5	4	17.4	0	0.0	23
M	19	73.1	5	19.2	2	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	26
N	6	26.1	14	60.9	2	8.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	23
O	6	27.3	6	27.3	7	31.8	2	9.1	1	4.5	22
P	6	23.1	8	30.8	9	34.6	3	11.5	0	0.0	26
Q	4	15.4	3	11.5	13	50.0	4	15.4	2	7.7	26
R	2	8.3	7	29.2	11	45.8	4	16.7	0	0.0	24
S	7	28.0	8	32.0	7	28.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	25
T	9	36.0	10	40.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	25
Total	155	35.0	158	35.7	97	21.9	27	6.1	6	1.3	443

Note. Items are identified on the next page.

Attitude Scale for Teachers
Identification of Items

What are your feelings about the following:

A. The adequacy of the BIM in identifying G and T students

B. The appropriateness of the CBC curriculum as the basis for the instruction of G and T students

C. The level of intellectual/academic functioning required of students in the project

D. The degree to which you are given the opportunity to be creative and innovative

E. The use of a differentiated curruculum to meet student needs

F. The use of a differentiated curriculum to meet student modes of learning

G. The value of the Olympics of the Mind Competition for students

H. The value of your teaming effort with counselors, principals, and other teachers

I. The value of student internships and work experiences with various social and private organizations. (If not applicable, do not respond).

J. The value of community mentors. (If not applicable, do not respond).

K. The value of parental involvement

L. The adequacy of parental involvement

M. The value of field trips

N. The appropriateness of the materials and supplies funded by the G and T Project

O. The adequacy of the materials and supplies funded by the G and T Project

P. The adequacy of the amount of time allocated to the G and T Project for instruction

Q. The adequacy of the amount of time allocated to the G and T Project for planning

R. The convenience of the schedule of the G and T classes

S. Opportunities provided for personal/professional growth and development

T. The value of staff development activities to you

Table 4

Instructional Strategies
Preferred by Teachers

Strategy	No.	%
Bloom's Taxonomy	17	73.9
Discovery Model	13	56.5
Inquiry Model	11	47.8
Renzulli's Model	8	34.8
Williams' Model	2	8.7
Guilford's Model	2	8.7

Note. The percentage is greater than 100% because respondents could select more than one strategy.

N=23

Table 5

Instructional Areas of Student Giftedness as Reported by Teachers

Instructional Area	No.	%
Language arts	19	73.1
Performing arts	15	57.7
Mathematics	13	50.0
Social studies	11	42.3
Science	10	38.5
Visual arts	8	30.8
Music	7	26.7
Foreign language	2	7.7

Note: The percentage is greater than 100% because respondents could select more than one area.

N=26

Table 6

Actual and Preferred Program Prototypes
Reported by Teachers

Integrated cluster grouping	6	25.0	7	29.2
Pull-out classes	16	66.7	5	20.8
Multi-age level grouping	10	41.7	5	20.8
Independent study projects	7	29.2	6	25.0
Intact classes for the gifted	8	33.3	12	50.0
Community mentors	4	16.7	5	20.8

Note. The percentage is greater than 100% because the respondents could select more than one program prototype.

N=24

Table 7

Level of Training of Teachers
in Gifted and Talented Education

Level	No.	%
Graduate only	18	69.2
Neither graduate nor undergraduate	7	26.9
Both graduate and undergraduate	1	3.9
Undergraduate only	0	0.0
Total	26	100.0

Table 8

Area of Undergraduate Specialization of Teachers

Specialization	Number of Teachers
Elementary education	4
Social studies	2
Spanish, education	1
English	1
English literature	1
History, computer science	1
Mathematics	1
Intermediate education	1
Special education	1
Total	13

Table 9

Area of Graduate Specialization of Teachers

Specialization	Number of Teachers
Reading	2
Administration supervision	2
Early childhood education	1
Differentiated instruction	1
Language arts	1
Education	1
Spanish	1
Gifted education	1
English, liberal studies	1
Special education	1
Reading, mathematics, art	1
Social studies	1
Mathematics	1
General	1
Total	16

Appendix G

Parent Responses to Questionnaire

Table 10

Adequacy of Information
Regarding Student Selection
for Gifted and Talented Program
as Reported by Parents

Information	No.	%
Adequate	121	71.2
Not adequate	49	28.8
Total	170	100.0

Table 11

Adequacy of Information
Regarding Student Participation
in Gifted and Talented Activities
as Reported by Parents

Information	No.	%
Adequate	109	63.7
Not adequate	62	36.3
Total	171	100.0

Table 12

Parent Perception of Student Benefit
in Gifted and Talented Program Areas

Program Area	Great No	Great %	Moderate No.	Moderate %	No Benefit No.	No Benefit %	Total No.	Total %
Reading	108	66.3	53	32.5	2	1.2	163	100.0
Creative writing	80	50.3	70	44.0	9	5.7	159	100.0
Oral expresssion	101	62.7	57	35.4	3	1.9	161	100.0
Mathematics	92	56.8	59	36.4	11	6.8	162	100.0
Creativity	112	67.5	54	32.5	0	0.0	166	100.0
Social development	105	63.7	56	33.9	4	2.4	165	100.0
Total	598	61.3	349	35.8	29	2.9	976	100.0

Parent Attitudes Toward Aspects of the Gifted and Talented Project

Program aspect	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
I have been sufficiently informed of my child's progress in the gifted program.	39	22.7	70	40.7	12	7.0	41	23.8	10	5.8	172	100.0	3.51
The teacher of the gifted is readily available if I request a conference.	51	29.8	76	44.4	39	22.8	3	1.8	2	1.2	171	100.0	4.00
My child receives a sufficient amount of individual attention in the gifted program.	45	26.2	75	43.6	47	27.3	5	2.9	0	0.0	172	100.0	3.93
The amount of time per week that my child spends in the gifted program is adequate.	39	22.9	74	43.5	42	24.7	13	7.7	2	1.2	170	100.0	3.79
My child is exposed to a variety of subjects in the gifted program.	58	34.5	77	45.8	22	13.1	9	5.4	2	1.2	168	100.0	4.07
The gifted program is challenging enough to motivate and stimulate my child.	68	39.3	74	42.8	23	13.3	8	4.6	0	0.0	173	100.0	4.17
The gifted program's instructional facilities are sufficient.	42	24.7	66	38.8	46	27.1	15	8.8	1	0.6	170	100.0	3.78
My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	102	60.4	58	34.3	7	4.1	2	1.2	0	0.0	169	100.0	4.54
Total	444	32.5	570	41.8	238	17.4	96	7.0	17	1.3	1365	100.0	---

APPENDIX H

QUESTIONNAIRES

Gifted/Talented Education Program
Attitude Scale for Students

PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH SIDES

Name _____ ID _____ School _____

Grade _____ Date _____ Boy or Girl (circle one).

1. We would like to know your feelings about the Gifted/Talented Education Program. Please read each of the following statements and indicate your response with a check mark ( ).

Aspects of the G/T Education Program	Like Very Much	Like A Little	Do Not Like	Not in my Program
1. The high expectation of the teacher				
2. The challenge of hard work				
3. The large amount of work				
4. The homework				
5. The kinds of things learned in				
a. mathematics				
b. language arts				
c. visual arts				
d. performing arts				
e. Other subject areas (please list);				
(i) _____				
(ii) _____				
6. The way the teacher(s) taught				
7. Being able to work on things on my own				
8. Being able to work on things with other G/T students				
9. Being able to learn a lot about many things				
10. Being able to learn new things				
11. Being able to be creative				
12. Being able to go on field trips				
13. Being able to work on special projects				

B. What did you like best about the G/T program?

C. What did you not like about the G/T program?

The Gifted/Talented Education Program
Attitude Scale for Teachers

Name _____ G/T Grade Level(s) _____

School _____ Date _____

We would like to know your attitude toward various aspects of the G/T program. Please complete the survey by checking the appropriate box after each item. Return the form to the G/T office as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. What are your feelings about the following:	Positive 5	4	3	2	Negative 1
a. The adequacy of the BIM in identifying G/T students					
b. The appropriateness of the CBC curriculum as the basis for the instruction of G/T students					
c. Level of intellectual/academic functioning required of students in the program					
d. The degree to which you are given the opportunity to be creative and innovative					
e. The use of a differentiated curriculum to meet student needs					
f. The use of a differentiated curriculum to meet student modes of learning					
g. The value of the Olympics of the Mind competition for students					
h. The value of your teaming effort with counselors, principals and other teachers					
i. The value of student internships and work experiences with various social and private organizations. (If not applicable, do not respond.)					
j. The value of community mentors. (If not applicable, do not respond.)					
k. The value of parental involvement					
l. The adequacy of parental involvement					
m. The value of field trips					
n. The appropriateness of the materials and supplies funded by the G/T Program					

What are your feelings about the following: (continued)

	Positive 5	4	3	2	Negative 1
o. The adequacy of the materials and supplies funded by the G/T Program					
p. The adequacy of the amount of time allocated to the G/T program for instruction					
q. The adequacy of the amount of time allocated to the G/T program for planning					
r. The convenience of the schedule of the G/T classes					
s. Opportunities provided for personal/ professional growth and development					
t. The value of staff development activities to you					

2. Which of the following instructional strategies do you prefer to use? (check all that apply)

a. Bloom's Taxonomy |___|
b. Williams' Model of learning |___|
c. Guilford's Structure of the Intellect |___|
d. Renzulli's Model |___|
e. The Inquiry Model |___|
f. The Discovery Model |___|
g. Other(s) (Please specify) |___|

_____

_____

3. In which of the following subject areas do you feel that the majority of your G/T students are gifted? (check all that apply)

a. Mathematics |___|
b. Language Arts |___|
c. Visual Arts |___|
d. Performing Arts |___|
e. Science |___|
f. Music |___|
g. Social Studies |___|
h. Other(s) (Please specify)
(i) _____ |___|
(ii) _____ |___|

4. Which of the following program prototypes fits the structure of your present project and which would you prefer?

	Actual	Preferred
a. Integrated Cluster Grouping	|___|	|___|
b. Pull-out Classes	|___|	|___|
c. Multi-age Level Grouping	|___|	|___|
d. Independent Study Projects	|___|	|___|
e. Intact classes for the Gifted	|___|	|___|
f. Community mentors	|___|	|___|
h. Other(s) (Please specify)		
_____	|___|	|___|
_____	|___|	|___|

5a. Have you had graduate or undergraduate training in G/T education?

Undergraduate Yes |___| No |___| Graduate Yes |___| No |___|

b. What was your area of specialization?

Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____

c. Indicate the number of G/T courses taken. Undergraduate ___ Graduate ___

6. How many years have you taught gifted/talented students (including the present year)? _____

7. Have you attended any G/T conferences seminars or workshops within the past year? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, Please list _____

_____

8. Comments:

Gifted/Talented Education Program

Attitude Scale for Parents

We would like to know your feelings about the Gifted/Talented Program. Please read each of the following statements and indicate your response by putting a check mark ( ) in the appropriate space.

School _____ Date _____

	Yes	No
1. Do you feel that you were provided with enough information about why your child was selected for the Gifted and Talented program?	____	____
2. Do you feel that you were provided with enough information about the activities and experiences in which your child participated while in the program?	____	____

3. To what extent does your child appear to be benefiting in the following areas as a result of participating in the program?

	Greatly Benefiting (2)	Moderately Benefiting (1)	Not Benefiting (0)
Language Skills			
Reading	_____	_____	_____
Creative Writing	_____	_____	_____
Oral Expression	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics Skills	_____	_____	_____
Creativity	_____	_____	_____
Social Development	_____	_____	_____

4. On the scale provided, rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Undecided or No Opinion 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
a. I have been sufficiently informed of my child's progress in the gifted program.	____	____	____	____	____

4. (continued)

Strongly	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Undecided or No Opinion 3	Agree 4	Agree 5
b. The teacher of the gifted is readily available if I request a conference.	____	____	____	____	____
c. My child receives a sufficient amount of individual attention in the gifted program.	____	____	____	____	____
d. The amount of time per week that my child spends in the gifted program is adequate.	____	____	____	____	____
e. My child is exposed to a variety of subjects in the gifted program.	____	____	____	____	____
f. The gifted program is challenging enough to motivate and stimulate my child.	____	____	____	____	____
g. The gifted program's instructional facilities are sufficient.	____	____	____	____	____
h. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	____	____	____	____	____

6. Comments about the Gifted/Talented Program: